

## REMARKS

The present Amendment and request for continued examination (RCE) is submitted in response to the Advisory Action mailed on November 4, 2009.

In the Continuation Sheet of the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that Fuhrmann's Fig. 1 shows an electronic device housing (1) with an essentially closed casing (410) since the cover or external wall element 14 at least partially covers the housing wall 5, that the external wall unit (14) also has a closed rim. The Examiner further points out that a rim portion of the external wall unit (14) covers housing (1). That is, Fuhrmann's housing (1) includes a rim (6) that is covered by the rim of the external wall unit (14) when assembled, so that the rim of the external wall unit (14) meets the limitations of claims 1 and 3.

In response, applicants have amended claim 1 as shown above in the Listing of Claims to better distinguish Fuhrmann. Amended independent claim 1 now calls out, in pertinent part, at least one exchangeable portion (420) consisting of a hollow only circumferentially closed rim (422) that is removably mounted to the closed casing (410) so as to cover only a circumferential edge (424) of the closed casing (410).

Claims 2 and 5-7 are amended to follow the claim 1 language and claim 4 is cancelled without disclaimer of subject matter.

So while Fuhrmann's external wall element (14) and rim covers side walls or rim (6) of housing element (3, 1), Fuhrman's external wall element (at least one exchangeable portion) does not consist of a hollow only circumferentially

closed rim that is removably mounted to the closed casing so as to cover only its circumferential edge, as claimed.

In view of the fact that Fuhrmann fails to disclose at least this feature of the invention, Fuhrmann does not anticipate amended independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 as amended is therefore patentable under 35 USC §102(b) over Fuhrmann. Claims 2 and 5-11, which depend from independent claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicants according request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 5-11 under 35 USC §102(b) over Fuhrmann.

Accordingly, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631 549 4700